



**DAUPHIN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS**

**LEGISLATIVE MEETING**

**February 25, 2004**

**10:00 a.m.**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Jeff Haste, Chairman  
Dominic D. DiFrancesco, II, Vice Chairman  
George P. Hartwick, III, Secretary

**STAFF PRESENT**

Chad Saylor, Chief Clerk; Bill Tully, Esq., Solicitor; Marie Rebuck, Controller; Robert F. Dick, Treasurer; President Judge Joseph Kleinfelter; Judge Scott Evans; James Zugay, Recorder of Deeds; Ed Marsico, District Attorney; Lowell Witmer, Clerk of Courts; Steve Farina, Prothonotary; Jack Lotwick, Sheriff; Randy Baratucci, Purchasing Director; Edgar Cohen, Facilities Maintenance Director; Guy Beneventano, Esq., Solicitor's Office; Robert Knupp, Esq., Solicitor's Office; Mike Pries, Security Director; Steve Howe, Director of Tax Assessment; Tom Guenther, Director of Information Technology; Gary Serhan, Deputy Controller; Steve Chiavetta, Director of Elections/Registration; Carolyn Thompson, Court Administrator; Mike Yohe, Budget Director; Garry Esworthy, Risk Manager; Sandy Moore, Human Services Director; Robert Burns, Commissioners' Office; Faye Fisher, Personnel Director; Kay Sinner, Personnel; Jennifer Kocher, Communications; Diane McNaughton, Communications; Sharon Ludwig, Personnel; Noel Falk, County Project Assistant; Donna Price, Controller's Office; Rita Shultz, Director of Domestic Relations; Dan Robinson, Director of Economic Development; Dave Schreiber, Personnel; Shari Eagle, Information Technology; Heidi Doyle of Domestic Relations; Kacey Truax, Commissioners' Office; Jena Wolgemuth, Commissioners' Office; Richie Martz, Commissioners' Office

**GUESTS PRESENT**

Mike Eakin; Jack Sherzer; Cheryl Saylor; Josh Wilson; Jennifer Storm; Carla Snyder; Loretta Barbee-Dare; Craig Zumburum; Dan Hayward; Vince Galko, Paul Lauchle; N. S. Allan; Clayton Gash

## **MINUTES**

### **CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Haste, Chairman of the Board, called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

### **MOMENT OF SILENCE**

Everyone observed a moment of silence.

### **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Everyone stood for the Pledge of Allegiance.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**It was moved by Mr. Hartwick and seconded by Mr. DiFrancesco that the Minutes of the January 28, 2004 Legislative Meeting and the February 4, 2004 Workshop Meeting be approved; motion carried.**

**It was moved by Mr. DiFrancesco and seconded by Ms. Rebuck that the Minutes of the January 28, 2004 Salary Board Meeting be approved; motion carried.**

### **OATH OF OFFICE**

Mr. Haste: We have the pleasure of swearing-in our Chief Clerk/Chief of Staff. Your Honor, will you come forward. Chad, would you like to introduce your honored guest.

Mr. Saylor: Justice Mike Eakin of the Supreme Court and my wife are here to assist.

Mr. Eakin: Would you raise your right hand and repeat after me? (Justice Eakin gave Chad the Oath of Office.)

Mr. Saylor: I, Chad Saylor, do solemnly swear that I will support, obey and defend the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and that I will discharge the duties of my office with fidelity.

(The Commissioners and the public congratulated him.)

### **ELECTION BOARD MEETING**

(The Minutes of the Election Board Meeting are on file in the Commissioners' Office.)

## **EXECUTIVE SESSIONS HELD BETWEEN MEETINGS**

Mr. Saylor: There were no Executive Sessions held since the last meeting.

## **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Mr. Haste: It is now the time for public participation. Is there anyone in the audience that would like to address the Board of Commissioners at this time? (There was no public participation.)

## **DEPARTMENT DIRECTORS/GUESTS**

Jennifer Storm/Carla Snyder/Jack Lotwick

Addressing Arrest Policies and Enforcement of Protection Orders Grant

Mr. Haste: This is a follow-up to our Workshop Meeting where we had a Grant Application with some questions on what we do after the third year.

Ms. Storm: I will defer those to the Sheriff.

Mr. Lotwick: One question pertained to the two deputy sheriffs that we are going to bring on board. A few weeks ago, you and I had a discussion about a couple of deputy sheriffs that were being paid full time salaries even though they are in a part time basis. They would be Roy Krow and William Snyder. According to the Union contract, they had enough hours last year to classify as full time. I would like to bring those two up into the full time list and take two other deputy sheriffs, Enrigue Tora and may be Dave Candrell and move them under Jennifer's grant. It shouldn't cost us any real money to transfer those two people over.

Mr. Haste: Those are two full timers you have now?

Mr. Lotwick: They are two part timers that would be moved to full time, even though they are being paid full time now.

Mr. Haste: You are going to use two existing staff and we would not be looking at two new ones coming in.

Mr. Lotwick: That is right. I would want to replace them. I have three vacancies. I also want to bring over Greg Klinger from Domestic Relations. By bringing him over, we would get 66% of his salary paid by the State, because we would use him in a Domestic Relations mode. That would give me a full complement. I have some vacancies that we could fill later in the part time realm. We don't use them that often anyway.

Mr. Hartwick: The question that I asked last week was related to after the three year grant runs out. If you could take a look at other counties to see how they maintained the level of service. Obviously, there is a requirement for us to do so if we take on the grant. Have you gotten any answers on that?

Ms. Storm: Yes, I looked into who was funded under this grant previously. Allegheny County got funding originally in 1998 when this grant came out. They were not refunded in 2001 and I didn't get an answer as to why. Butler County has gotten funding both years. This is actually the third time that this grant is going through. As of right now there are only two counties in Pennsylvania that are getting this grant; which is one of the reasons that it was so appealing to us.

Mr. Hartwick: For Allegheny County, you didn't get the reasons why?

Ms. Storm: I left several messages with the Department of Justice, but I didn't get a response.

Mr. Hartwick: Is there a requirement for us to maintain that complement of staff following the grant?

Ms. Storm: They requested a sustainability plan, which we did put together. It is essentially the same wording that you get with any Federal grant, if we don't refund it can you sustain it on your own. It is totally up to us to either sustain it or suspend the program if the funding is suspended.

Mr. Hartwick: As stated, I was in full support of the program. It is something that is much needed. The concern was, are we on the hook after three years and you are telling me we are not.

Ms. Storm: No. It would be up to us and if we can do the fundraising that would be great. If not, we would have to really assess other funding needs or maybe downsize the positions. I do have a dollar amount for you, which I didn't have last time. It is \$349,513.

Mr. Haste: The grant total.

Mr. Hartwick: Do we have any outcome measurements to judge the success of the program and to see how it has impacted the community?

Ms. Storm: Yes. There are different measuring tools that we are going to use because there are different positions. For my agency, we are really looking to do some training. We are going to do measurements of the training that has been done, via the STOP Grant. What this grant is supposed to do is to come up and partner with the STOP Grant. It is not supposed to replace what they are doing, it is supposed to accompany what they are doing. We are going to work hard with the Domestic Violence Task Force. We will be able to measure that by the number of individuals that we are training. I also want this individual to come up with some instruments that will also measure the amount of training that they are receiving, via a pre-test and post-test. We have to provide that to them as to how we are going to measure that. It is mainly going

to be in numbers, how many people we train, how many attend the events and the diversity of the training that we are doing.

Ms. Snyder: As far as the Pre-Trial aspect, we are getting a lot more clients under Pre-Trial. I have spoken with the district justices and they are willing to put more of the domestic violence cases under the Pre-Trial Supervision. Basically, it is just going to be keeping track of the numbers of clients that we serve as far as the domestic violence goes. Another aspect would be polling the district justices to see how it is working, once it gets beyond arraignment to the preliminary hearing stage to try to get some kind of a feedback from the district justices. Maybe on a six month basis to try to see if we can get any feedback as to how we could do things better. There are a lot of domestic violence cases now that are going unsupervised before their preliminary hearing.

Ms. Storm: The Grant requires us to strictly just report back numbers. They want to see how many people did you train, the demographics of who we trained and that. We want to go above and beyond and really try and find out if the training that we are doing is effective.

Mr. Haste: As you gather that information can you bring it to the Board so that we are kept aware of what is going on.

Ms. Storm: We can give you a quarterly progress report or whatever you would like.

Mr. Lotwick: With the service of these grants, we are already doing the work. This would dedicate just two people to do it on a regular full time basis. By doing that, we are just going to pick up the salaries as opposed to the hit and miss way that we have to do it now. When we get the paperwork in, it is given to the two guys. Now, it would be a regular team ready to go and it would be much more efficient.

## **SALARY BOARD**

(The Salary Board Minutes are on file in the Commissioners' Office.)

## **PERSONNEL**

Ms. Sinner: I do have an Addendum here. There is a Vacancies Listing Addendum for a judicial law clerk vacancy in Judge Evan's Office. We are requesting approval to fill that vacancy. The person who would be filling that is listed on the New Hires Listing Addendum #1. I now have an hourly rate to put into that.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I would like to address that, if it is the right time. I would like to make a recommendation that that position be handled with the following two additional items. That is that the rate be paid at an hourly rate of \$19.66; which is actually above the starting salary level. What we have here is the opportunity to draw in a person that has a great reputation in the community as an experienced attorney and would be someone that would enhance the image of Dauphin County going forward. The other part of that

is that I would like to ask that we waive the 90-day waiting period requirement for benefits, in an effort to give Dauphin County the opportunity to attract this high caliber person to our team.

Judge Kleinfelter: May I be heard before you vote on that Addendum?

Mr. Haste: Let's go through the packet and we usually adopt the packet as a whole. Kay, go through the packet and then we will go back.

Ms. Sinner: There is a Changes Listing Addendum and there are three items on that. In the New Hire Listing, I presented last week, I would ask that you pull Item #3. In the Changes Listing, since the Court Salary Board items are on hold right now, I would ask that you hold off on Item #7's transfer. That is everything. I just replaced that overtime listing.

**It was moved by Mr. DiFrancesco and seconded by Mr. Hartwick that the Board approve the Personnel Packet with the changes as mentioned above by Ms. Sinner.**

#### **Discussion:**

Judge Kleinfelter: I would like to ask that the Board not adopt the recommendation or the change proposed by Commissioner DiFrancesco and I do so for several reasons. You may or may not know the background of this position that is being filled. As I am sure you do know, each Judge is allotted a judicial law clerk and there is a regular salary scale for new law clerks with incremental steps over the years. We have, as a matter of court policy, that every new attorney that is hired in this position comes in at the entry level. We have had attorneys with experience. One of them was hired several years ago with over ten years experience. They came to work for one of our judges at that entry level. When this position became open, I learned indirectly that Judge Evans had proposed the hiring of Karen Coates, who is indeed a very competent lawyer with many years experience, to fill the vacancy occasioned by the retirement of Scott McClure. Our protocol in the Court Departments is that when a vacancy is to be filled the Department Head or the Judge, in this case, makes a recommendation or a suggestion through Court Administration. Judge Evans did not do that in this case and instead he submitted directly to the Personnel Department a request to hire Ms. Coates at \$42,000 per year. When I learned about that on January 13<sup>th</sup>, I sent Judge Evans a letter explaining to him several things. First of all, reminding him what the hiring protocol was that it was to go through Court Administration and ultimately the President Judge. Secondly, I reminded him of past practice that is new lawyers come in at the starting salary. I reminded him that the budget would not accommodate the salary that he was requesting. That is the amount requested was greater than the position he was filling and therefore the money was not in the budget for that. I also reminded him, and I hope you can appreciate this, that one of my responsibilities as the President Judge is to keep peace among all of the judges and all of the district justices and to the extent that anyone of those people goes directly to a County Commissioner and tries to bypass

County Court Administration that kind of maneuver undermines not only the authority of the President Judge and Court Administration, but it invites and I hope you can appreciate this, it sets a precedent which would invite future department heads, judges, district justices, to bring every salary consideration directly to a county commissioner; which now puts you with an extra responsibility which I don't think you need. I am very troubled with the way this has come before the Board this morning. It is obvious that Judge Evans, who is in the audience, contacted Commissioner DiFrancesco and asked him to do this. He bypassed Court Administration and bypassed me and apparently persuaded Commissioner DiFrancesco that this was a good move. This is really not about the money, even though if you approve this you have taken the step to overspend my budget for this position. I think that is unfortunate in and of itself, but more importantly you set this precedent that invites judges to bypass the President Judge and Court Administration. I sent Judge Evans a letter offering a compromise. The compromise was that because of Ms. Coates' experience I would agree to hire her at the same salary as Scott McClure. That is the law clerk, whose position was being vacated. That would not affect my budget, because we had already budgeted Mr. McClure's salary. Judge Evans has not responded to this letter, other than as I come here this morning, I hear that he has talked to a Commissioner and asked the Commissioner to bump what I had recommended in writing, copied Commissioner DiFrancesco with a recommended salary for Ms. Coates of \$19.05, that is \$39,624 per year, which was the salary authorized for Mr. McClure. If you approve this addendum today, you are saying that what the President Judge thinks about this in managing his salary and trying to keep parity among all the other judges, you are basically undermining all of this. Every judge and I can tell you that when judges hear that some special favoritism was shown in this position, that has been denied in the past, that will be an open invitation for everyone with a salary issue to come directly to this Board. I don't think you want that frankly. I think what we have offered in this case is clear and I am urging you to hire Ms. Coates at the salary presented in the Personnel Packet.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I have two items that I have questions on. The first is this salary matches another law clerk's salary, which is one of the recommendations. I am going on the fact that as I understand Judge Hoover's law clerk had similar experience coming in.

Judge Kleinfelter: Are you talking about Pam Parascadola? An attorney with over ten years experience was hired at the entry level position, even below this one. She was hired at what we start all the law clerks.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Did she get bumped up then?

Judge Kleinfelter: She has been here several years.

Mr. Haste: It says 2003. This shows three law clerks hired in 2003 with different salaries so something implies that they either didn't start at the entry level or something occurred in the meantime.

Judge Kleinfelter: I think that one did not pass the bar exam.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Was Ms. Parascadola hired before May 8, 2003?

Judge Kleinfelter: I wasn't prepared.

Mr. DiFrancesco: The information that I am going on is that she was hired May 8<sup>th</sup> and currently...

Mr. Haste: The numbers that we have been provided makes it appear that not all have been hired at the entry level, because they are at different salaries with basically the same or similar start dates. Something happened that has them at different salary levels.

Judge Kleinfelter: I really was not prepared to go back and discuss the history of it, but that sort of misses the point. The real point here is do the County Commissioners want to expose themselves to second guessing of what we are doing in Court Administration. Because, what you in essence are doing by even considering this is saying to every employee who works for Dauphin County, and not just in the Courts, that if you are not satisfied with what your director is recommending for a salary take it directly to the Board of Commissioners. This is a matter of principle more than it is the direct dollars that are involved. It does affect my budget. If you approve it you are now overspending my budget.

Mr. Haste: This proposal is budget neutral. He didn't fill a position for a while so he saved the funds.

Judge Kleinfelter: So, then there apparently has been discussions between the Judge and the Commissioners. That is part of the problem. The Judge knows that he should present his recommendation—it is his absolute choice as to who he hires, but the salary and budget issues are the prerogative of the Court Administration; which is ultimately me. By engaging in a dialogue with a Judge as to why what the President Judge is doing or suggesting is not correct, you now opened that up. Every judge, district justice, directors, etc. will say well what you say Mr. President Judge doesn't matter. All we have to do is make our case directly with a county commissioner. I hope you were able to look down the line.

Mr. DiFrancesco: It is important to note, this recommendation that I bring here was not made lightly. I say that knowing that you disagree with the fact that I brought it here and I respect that. One of the positions that we are all going to have to weigh going forward is the fact that there is a defined chain of command in every department. Quite honestly in my mind I believe that individuals have to use very, very good judgment when they have exercised the chain of command and feel that there is a reason why they are not getting satisfaction. You are right, every time this comes up before this Board, we are going to have to look at it and say did that person... I have had others try to do the

exact bad side of that and that is to approach us on something that they didn't get satisfaction for and the director made the right call.

Judge Kleinfelter: You will find that every department and you can't blame him for that will try to get the highest salary for their people. They are looking at their shop and what they can do for that person. When they come to you they do it with that myopic approach. Someone in-between has to look at the global approach. I have to make sure that there is parity among all of the people that work for me. I got to try and maintain some kind of order and protocol for the hiring process, the salary process and the budget process. If you accept this position, you are basically saying okay it is open season. Bypass the procedure and come directly to the Board. I hope you think long and hard about it. I will be very disappointed if you act according to this recommendation.

Mr. Evans: I want to correct some of the statements that were made, because it puts it into an incorrect light and I think you need to take an historical look at that. I am hoping that Mr. Haste will recall back when he was Chief Clerk, when judges first came on we were invited to go see the commissioners, by virtue of Judge Morgan and Judge Morrison, as President Judges, to discuss bringing in lateral movements and the like whenever we were first elected. I explained that to Judge Kleinfelter. I did not submit a proposal to Personnel prior to speaking to Judge Kleinfelter. On the personnel paperwork I received, because I am the elected official and it is my employee, at the top of one of the documents it says before you do anything go see your oversight commissioner. You are my oversight commissioner and I went to see you. I told you what the situation was and I made an assessment as a salary that I thought was fair and would fit within the scheme of all the other law clerks and I submitted it to you. As I did my math sitting back there, you are not granting the salary that I have sought. I went to Judge Kleinfelter, I took him out of the blue. I didn't have an appointment, so I have to be fair in that regard. Whenever he complained that I had gone to a commissioner and I had gone also to the Chairman, because that has always been my practice as a director as Public Defender and coming here as a Judge. I told him that is why I was there to see him and I saw Carolyn Thompson. I left the paperwork with him. The paperwork remained with the President Judge and told him that I would be available to discuss it in the future. I did get a letter from him and I saw his two complaints. One, I thought had merit. One, I did not. So, I remained to be able to make this a budget neutral issue. If I have bypassed the protocol as the President Judge wants it, I apologize openly and publicly because I did not mean to be of any offense or affront to him. I don't mean to put any major pressure in way, shape or form on any of you. In fact, there are some of you I didn't even speak to about the issue that was coming here today. I think my response to you Mr. DiFrancesco was take an assessment, here are the figures and make a call. Here is what her qualifications are, here are some complaints from some other folks and some support I have had from other folks. Lastly, although I appreciate the President Judge has an unbelievable task of trying to oversee the entire Court system, I think as an elected Judge I have the ability and right and should come to you if I see something that I disagree with. Number two if it is truly only his call for the Court budget, then why have a Salary Board. If that

was true, then there would be no need for any of you. He would have that control. The power and jurisdiction has been given to the Salary Board for the five of you to use your collective wisdom, decide what you think is right and good for the County of Dauphin and move accordingly. That is all I ask. If you have any questions, I'll answer any that you have.

Mr. Haste: Is there any further discussion?

Mr. DiFrancesco: I just want to state again just to be clear, the request did come and I did take the time to follow-up with some other individuals to find out the details of this individual and the qualifications and so forth. She did come highly recommended. Her family has served the County well. I had the opportunity to talk to some other people. I talked to the Solicitor to see what he knew of her reputation. The other factor that did go in was with respect to the budget that it was presented to me that it would not have a material impact on the budget; which is another reason why I factored that in. Again, I presented that to the Board understanding all the details, understanding the President Judge's concern, I would still recommend the salary as I presented it and would ask for your consideration.

Mr. Haste: I would like to thank you, because I know this is not an easy situation and Mr. DiFrancesco did do a fair amount of homework that he presented to the Board so that we could make a decision.

**Question:** Mr. Haste – Aye; Mr. DiFrancesco – Aye; and Mr. Hartwick – Aye; motion carried.

## **PURCHASE ORDERS**

Mr. Baratucci: What I just handed you is an item that did not get to me in time to be in the Purchase Order Packet. It is an item that Mr. Cohen had discussed with Commissioner DiFrancesco yesterday. It is an item that is needed at Spring Creek. Mr. DiFrancesco had mentioned to go ahead and have it added to the Packet for approval. If you can add that one to the Packet and Mr. Cohen is here and can explain why it is needed to be added today and not held over until next week.

Mr. DiFrancesco: As all of you know there are ongoing concerns at Spring Creek in terms of trying to bring that facility in general up to speed. One of the issues that had come up, one of the very important things as you can imagine is the regulation of the hot water as it comes through the facility in making sure that the water is gauged so that nobody could get scalded or burned from it. That is one of the issues that could actually cause the Department of Health to come in and shut us down immediately if we are having problems with that. As I understand and Edgar I might need you to clarify, traditionally what we have done is used a manner in which the controls are regulated. This would more or less regulate it from the line.

Mr. Cohen: Yes.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Budget impact, these changes probably would have taken place in a different fashion. I am not sure what the dollar amount is.

Mr. Cohen: It is \$75 for every existing valve. There are 14 mixing valves that are done twice a year.

Mr. DiFrancesco: We want to make sure that the protections are in place. Otherwise, we again jeopardize the facility and we don't want to do that. As far as dollar figures, it is a different matter, but the impact should be minimally different. I would ask you to consider this, because it is critical.

Mr. Baratucci: One item that we did add to the Packet that did make it in here is on Page 24. That is, as I promised a couple weeks ago, when we had a Purchase Order to cover the costs for ZA at Spring Creek for the first month. This is now a Purchase Order to cover the estimated cost that they think as a maximum for the next three months. That item is on here. Mr. DiFrancesco may want to speak to this. We have not, at this point, identified all of the funding to take care of this, but I will defer to Commissioner DiFrancesco, because it is showing up here as a large over budget that still needs to be addressed.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I realize as the oversight Commissioner for Spring Creek, I come here and ask you for a lot of consideration, because at this point we are looking at about \$600,000 of really unbudgeted spending that we are talking about in order to get this facility back in place. While we haven't gotten all the ducks in order I am being assured that, through the business office and better management practices, we will be able to recover this money over the course of the year. The goal would be to come in below our original budget number of \$3.2 million. I really do not like coming to you and asking you to vote for an item that is unbudgeted and yet we are still in that position where Spring Creek needs special consideration and attention in order to get the ultimate infrastructure in place. We basically put out the fires that were burning. What we are doing now is shoring up the staff to make sure that we never backslide into the position that we were in and to do that it requires a little more manpower and a little more knowledge than what we would possess in our own staff. We agreed to this four month contract. The first month of that was really the crisis response and the next three months, as I see it, will be putting those procedures in place shoring up training, shoring up our staffing, identifying areas where we can cut overtime costs, where we can cut the use of agency nursing and better staff our shifts, all of these things are going to result in tremendous savings, but I have to stand honestly before you today and tell you that what I am asking you for is to agree to a maximum number, at this point, is unfounded with no revenue source to back it up.

Mr. Hartwick: I believe last week Commissioner DiFrancesco, I commended you on taking on such a challenging task and also the great job that you have been doing. However, I would be remiss in not taking care of my obligation and trying to get some of the answers from ZA and the Budget Office to solidify how we are going to recoup these

unbudgeted expenditures. First of all, ZA was a great choice. They are moving the Manor in the right direction. I think I would feel much more comfortable voting to approve it, and again I am only one vote, with seeing a plan from ZA and our Budget Office on how we can recoup this unbudgeted \$600,000 and with substantial numbers in front of me that indicate that there is a solid plan in order to recoup these dollars. For me that would allow me to have a peace of mind and also rather than just relying on saying that we have an idea in the way that budget money will be refunded, I would rather see a specific plan and talk about figures and dollars and how that matches up to the \$600,000 in spending that we may incur with ZA's proposal. You were left with a daunting task and I think you have done a commendable job, but we also need to make sure all the right questions are answered as we move forward and try to approve these budgeted items. For that specific item, I would like to see a plan and I know we had that executive session with ZA. They answered a lot of questions. Some of those questions related to the budget and how we are going to recoup those monies have never been presented to me formally. It may have been presented to you, but for that peace, I would prefer to see that plan before we move ahead for my personal satisfaction.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I have a sketch plan that I can show you after the meeting. It is a logical sketch plan that they have provided to me. I can see where there probably will be savings that they made no guarantees at this point, but I will indeed share that with you. It still seems to me that finding very close to \$1,000,000 in savings this year is a possibility, but again the alternative is if we don't find it then we have a real serious issue we have to deal with. I can tell you there has been a certain amount of discomfort in my stomach as I continue to move forward on this and I am sure it is with yours as well as you see these numbers come across the table. I will act as quickly as I possibly can to get you that information. I can tell you that so far the result as been the finding of pockets of like \$20,000, but it will take quite a bit more money than that in order to make it happen. I will respond to your request.

Mr. Hartwick: My only other request is as we bring on the new staff that we have hired at Spring Creek and the Prison, if we can kind of keep a gauge on overtime and how we cut down on those overtime costs as a result of the new hires.

Mr. DiFrancesco: That was one of the issues that I wanted to bring up anyway. I have already met with some of my people, for instance, we approved to filling up several vacancies out at the Schaffner Center. I met with the Director of the Schaffner Center to sit down and say we need to closely monitor the impact of these hirings. I want to be able to say that our overtime budget will save this much money because of these hirings and actually show through these moves how we saved the County money. That is going to be important for all of us to know that in the end run.

Mr. Hartwick: What is the timeframe on approving the extension of the contract for three months? Is there any way that we can table that until we have the necessary information to make that decision or do you need a vote on that today?

Mr. DiFrancesco: We do have to vote on that today and the reason is because actually we are not extending the contract. The contract is already in force. The decision that we made upfront was to approve the initial PO; which allowed for the first cap at \$195,000.

Mr. Hartwick: Which we supported.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Right. If we don't approve this today, what happens is that they are under the expectation of a two week turnaround on their invoices. ZA is not a huge company that can float the level of money that we are talking about in terms of turning around and paying their employees that are working for us. We are working on about a two week turnaround. If we approve this PO today, the cash flow keeps going. If it is not approved until next week, we probably would cause a delay in I am guessing some invoices and I am not sure how many will be impacted. Unfortunately, some of these invoices tend to be pretty sizable in number.

Mr. Hartwick: I don't want to delay the project, but I do have a serious concern and would appreciate having those questions answered before I cast a vote in affirmative to extend the contract.

Mr. Haste: This is a not to exceed.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Correct.

Mr. Haste: Is there a leeway in this contract, an out clause?

Mr. DiFrancesco: We have the ability to approve the hours that they are recommending.

Mr. Haste: So, if in fact, it appears that they can't hit the target or something makes you think that they can't hit the target, there is a way to crank this, ratchet this down.

Mr. DiFrancesco: We would have the ultimate authority to approve the hours that they are using under this contract.

Mr. Hartwick: Out of the first \$195,000 that we approved. What was the used amount of \$195,000 that was budgeted by ZA?

Mr. DiFrancesco: I'm not sure that we have all the invoices in.

Mr. Baratucci: At the top of Page 24, it shows that that particular line item is over \$213,583. Now, I don't know that that is all attributed to there, because that is everything in that particular line item. I assume a big chunk and I had heard that they were pretty much close to the \$195,000.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I have not seen the final invoices. It is my expectation that they would use the whole \$195,000. That was exclusive of expenses. Some of the overage would be probably expense money as well. The not to exceed \$195,000 was actually costs of ours. There was also a provision in there that there would be expense money on top of that.

Mr. Hartwick: I know initially in our discussion that the \$195,000 we were hoping not to get to.

Mr. DiFrancesco: As was I.

Mr. Hartwick: That seems like we are there.

Mr. DiFrancesco: The expectation would be under this not to exceed \$405,000 and unless we get involved and say reduce your hours you can almost assume that they are going to go to that level.

Mr. Hartwick: Again, I want to commend you on the job that you doing. I know you face a daunting challenge, but those are some questions that I have to have answered before I move in the affirmative.

Mr. Haste: I believe Jena has something.

Mr. DiFrancesco: (Jena handed papers to the Commissioners) What you just have been handed are the hours that they are recommending under this contract. On the second sheet, which is the email, in the third paragraph it talks about the possibility of finding an attainable \$1.1 million, but this is saying between now and the year end 2005. I am working off of an \$800,000 figure for this year.

Mr. Hartwick: I appreciate Jena, who has been unbelievable in providing information, the information that I was trying to get solid was the reimbursement of the expenditures.

Mr. DiFrancesco: On that particular memo, which there is another one that I have that has a breakdown chart, which shows it a little more specifically where they hope to accomplish this. They want to renegotiate a few contracts, get some benefits in terms of some efficiencies that we can pick up and what they are proposing does not seem unrealistic to me, however, not being in that field I still have some discomfort saying okay can you achieve these or can you not achieve these. My action would be to give me very conservative numbers that I definitely can achieve and exceed them. I am hoping that is their philosophy as well.

Mr. Hartwick: Have we realized any savings as a result of their first month in their capacity as Manager of Spring Creek?

Mr. DiFrancesco: We are not any where near a position where we can result in savings. The type of things that we are getting has been through their oversight of the business

office. They have been able to identify pockets of money and again a \$20,000 number keeps sticking in my head of things that they have been able to go after that either have been delayed or even lost in years past. We have talked in the past about the one particular patient who was there for six or seven years to the tune of several hundred thousand dollars and never made a payment. Those are the types of things they are identifying right now. Money that we have had the ability to make a claim against, but in the past have not been. That is where we will see the first efficiencies. I think now also what you are going to find is once we have gotten out of that first month crisis phase they will also be able to better address the personnel issues of how we can use our staff more efficiently, how we can use agency nursing and agency CNA's to a lesser degree and will save us a tremendous amount of money. Unfortunately I don't think I have the numbers in front of me. I did last week. I don't want to say that using agency nurses double what it costs us to use an employee, but it is significantly more money. Agency nursing and use of agency personnel costs the County a tremendous amount of money as does the overtime. We are already taking steps to eliminate overtime in areas such as maintenance, where realistically you just cannot justify the historic use of overtime in certain areas. We were paying people overtime to paint things that should have been done on the clock. They were using overtime in some of the administrative areas, things that just didn't make sense. We are starting to tighten those positions up. In a facility where we are looking at probably, we can argue between a \$1 million or \$2 million fat budget, maybe even more than that, what we are going to see is some savings, but I don't know if they are going to be readily identifiable given the fact that this contract has been so expensive. It is really going to be an offset at this point.

Mr. Haste: Actually, the first savings that we realized was that we got our license back and the second is that we were able to maintain a federal revenue stream that was going to shut off. Thank goodness we didn't realize those losses. Those are in fact savings that I think are substantial in this process.

Mr. DiFrancesco: That literally would have closed the facility down. There is no way that we could have lost that revenue.

Mr. Haste: It is also clear that just going through this and I think one of the reasons we need to go out and hire was the leadership team was not the appropriate team to keep that facility open and running. Their track record showed that they were not capable of doing that. I think that given this is a not to exceed and that we have some leeway to ratchet this down if the need is necessary, I would be willing to support this with one little caveat. If you could have ZA, in the very near future, come in with a game plan so we do have some understanding of where they anticipate going. I quite frankly, if the savings is realized over a couple of years, I understand that with this and many other projects that we are faced with, some of the holes that have been dug for us we won't recover in a year. We have a couple years. We talked about needing to have multi year plans. I think that is realistic in this case as well. I would be willing to move this forward and just ask that they come in, in the near future, with a game plan.

Mr. DiFrancesco: In a Workshop setting?

Mr. Haste: Yes.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I think, my expectation again, is that by the end of this week I would have more firm numbers. I believe next week, we probably can get them on the agenda. I respect the opinions that are being offered and in fact I will sit down with them and will continue to monitor this very closely to make certain that we are not spending more money in these fees than we have to. When I got the current numbers back I was a little surprised because I thought they were a little higher than what I expected. I am assuming that we can sit down and ratchet that back a little bit or at least make them justify exactly what is going on now. We all know that through the crisis phase the number was not going to be very pretty, but we had to act quickly. It was going to take a pretty sizeable force and I have to say too that the folks that I have worked with over there, the folks that they brought in on this team, I have a great deal of respect for them. I was very impressed with their professional abilities and I do agree that ZA was the right team and they have impressed me even more so being on the job. They have done a great job for Dauphin County.

Mr. Hartwick: Prior to the vote, just one last comment, I just need to have the information to feel comfortable in moving forward.

Mr. Baratucci: The rest of the packet is as it was presented last week. That includes the items on Page 23; which are items that do not show a line item budget problem. It is a relatively minor expense that is being charged to our construction project. I know there has been a number of meetings since last week, and I know that there continues to be discussions about how to solve that problem. I don't know whether this minor expense is an issue any more or not, but as it stands now it would be approved and spent out of the construction project funds. I need your direction on what to do with Page 23.

Mr. Haste: This is out of the construction budget?

Mr. Baratucci: As it stands now, it is money coming out of the construction budget.

Mr. Haste: Did Mr. Yohe open up a new credit card account or how did he find money for this?

Mr. Yohe: I simply moved money out of the Building Construction on paper in this line item. That is all I did. I didn't change any of the facts as represented last week or the financial status didn't change.

Mr. Baratucci: That is what I meant. This doesn't change anything from what you have been discussing for the last week. We still have that much larger issue. This is a relatively small issue and I need your direction on what we are going to do with these two items.

Mr. Haste: Given the fact that we know there is a thunderstorm ahead when it comes to the cost overruns on this project, I don't see how we can continue to add to that problem. I will not support paying for this out of the construction fund. I don't know where my two colleagues are on this, but given the problems that we know are there it makes no sense, even though it is a small amount, to pay this out of construction.

Mr. Baratucci: If the Courts are still here, obviously this could be transferred and paid out of the Court's budget, if they are willing to do that in order to get these items ordered. That is another solution. The other idea is just to pull it out of here and wait until the grand plan is acted upon. Those are the options. I just need to know whether I include it, charge it to the Courts, or leave it all together.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I am assuming that a garment rack will not cause any delays in the project and with that it would probably be best if the Board put this off until we can come up with the whole grand plan and understand exactly what we are dealing with. If I am wrong on that and for some reason the garment rack would cause delays then we may want to discuss that right now. It seems to me like the best course of action would be to get a plan within the very close future.

Mr. Hartwick: I think I have made my opinions very clear on this matter as well. I have also been trying to develop a timeline and also to decipher where the delays have occurred and who is responsible for those delays and place the appropriate responsibility and accountability in those areas. Until we are in a position to come forth with a grand plan and how monies are going to be spent out of the budget that was already granted an additional \$1 million and now it appears that a request is going to be made for an additional \$800,000, we really need to come up with a substantial plan on how we are going to pay for these items. I don't believe the shelf garment rack will cause delays, but until we come up with a plan it certainly does not have my support.

Mr. Baratucci: It sounds like I have my answer, I will pull that item off of my report. Is that what I am hearing?

All: Yes.

Mr. Baratucci: If the Board could approve the Purchase Order Packet, minus Page #23 and with the addition of the valves for Spring Creek, the extra Purchase Order.

**It was moved by Mr. DiFrancesco and seconded by Mr. Haste that the Board approve the Purchase Order Packet, minus Page #23 and with the addition of the Purchase Order for valves for Spring Creek.**

**Question:** Mr. Haste – Aye; Mr. DiFrancesco – Aye; and Mr. Hartwick – Nay; motion carried.

## **REPORT FROM BUDGET & FINANCE – MIKE YOHE, BUDGET DIRECTOR**

The following report was presented by Mr. Yohe, Budget & Finance Director:

### **Report from the Office of Budget & Finance February 25, 2004**

- **February 13, 2004** transferred **\$260,375.15** to the **Payables** account **from the County's Concentration account** for checks issued that week.
- **February 20, 2004** transferred **\$4,827,254.15** to the **Payables** account **and \$1,859,371.08** to the **Payroll** account **from the County's Concentration account** for checks issued that week.
- **Total Term Investments – N/A**
- **Balance today in INVEST account \$121,339.79 rate 1.00%**
- **Balance today in Community Banks Money Market account \$19,827,077.72 rate 2.00%**

Mr. Yohe: We had to make a second draw on our line of credit for February 19, 2004, an additional \$1.8 million was drawn down; which brings the total today of \$4,650,000 drawn against the \$15 million line of credit. I would anticipate probably at least two more payout weeks where we probably will have to tap into that and then the taxes should start coming in strong.

The second item is the Budget Amendments that we touched on briefly at the Workshop last week. This is just a formal approval process, I realize neither of you were here for the December 31<sup>st</sup>, but I ask you to vote. They are just changes in the bottom line of any fund. At the end of the first quarter you will have your own amendments to vote on.

Mr. Hartwick: Do you need action?

Mr. Yohe: Yes.

**It was moved by Mr. Hartwick and seconded by Mr. DiFrancesco that the Board approve the 2003 Calendar Year Budget Amendments through December 31, 2003 (Final) and the 2003-2004 Fiscal Budget Amendments through December 31, 2003; motion carried.**

Mr. Yohe: There was some question at the Workshop Meeting also on the vacancy adjustment that is in the budget. I thought I would print out my worksheet that I use to monitor that. What you are looking at, at the top, I keep track of non-Court and Court vacancies. This is only the General Fund. The total as it stood after the 2/4/03 Workshop Agenda, we had \$1,819,000 worth of vacancies, that is in the salary amounts. The vacancy adjustment is \$1 million, so we had a positive variance of

\$819,000. That is what I look at. The items that were approved today, when I look at the Workshop Agendas, that would bring that variance down from \$819,000 down to between \$200,000 and \$300,000. I don't update this until after the approval process on your end. I will be able to give you a more definitive figure as to what that number is. I thought I would bring this to your attention. I can produce this at any time. I don't want to put all these in and then you refuse, turn down or vote down several of the items on it. I do add them up, compare them to what it is and I can give you a rough idea of what you are looking at.

Mr. DiFrancesco: This is just a straight or simple number. Obviously, you wouldn't be able to factor in the Schaffner Center, if we hire more people the overtime costs will go down. This is just straight based on open vacancies.

Mr. Yohe: Exactly. As long as we keep this positive we would be meeting that vacancy adjustment. There is an adjustment on the benefit end also, but as long as we meet the salary end, the benefits savings will follow.

Mr. Haste: I do think we need to track one other thing. We need to take a look at the overtime dollars that have been budgeted, because, one goes hand-in-hand. So, the same thing that you do here I would like us to start doing on the overtime costs as well. In theory, and some of the arguments are made, that if you add certain positions you are able to recover the costs in overtime and sometimes even save money because overtime costs are higher than others. To get a true picture we need to look at both of those. Quite frankly, it would be great if we get both of them heading in the right direction. I don't know how difficult that would be, but I would ask that let's take a look at the County's overall overtime budgets as well, because we are going to take a hard look at those.

Mr. Yohe: As long as we are above the \$1 million you are okay. Obviously, we know the overtime savings are following. I would anticipate that if we fill a few positions and we get below that \$1 million maybe then the rationale is the overtime savings would come into play also. I will try and keep track of that.

Mr. Haste: I would like to know that before we get to that point. In fact, if it is not working that way then we need to have some serious talks with some of the directors and I would like to see that trend before we get into trouble as opposed to after we are in trouble.

Mr. Yohe: Again, I can report what has been spent in overtime and I can take the department heads word for what the savings will or should be, but it is going to be an estimate at best.

Mr. Haste: If they say they are going to save \$20,000 in overtime, maybe we remove it from that line item and put it in an escrow somewhere or do something as you move the money around, maybe you can do it to help us out.

Mr. DiFrancesco: We know already that there are going to be two very high ticket items that will impact the budget in ways that have not been budgeted for. I know that I will be meeting with all my oversights and putting the word out as I am going to share this message with all the County departments, now is another time where you are going to have to look at your budget and we may be coming back asking if there were major purchases that were to take place in this year, for instance, if a vehicle purchase could be put off until next year, even though it was budgeted, because there is going to come a point in time, between the Courthouse Renovation Project and what is going on at Spring Creek, that we are going to be knocking on people's doors again because the revenue is not there right now and we need to find it some place for these projects. Again, I think I made this comment early on, this is not just a Commissioners' issue, this is a County-wide issue and every department will be held accountable. It is not going to be comfortable for anybody going forward, but this is not something that we can say okay well we incur these costs, let's just wait until next year and address it through taxes or some other manner. This is an issue that has to be dealt with in this year's budget and it is very much a cash flow issue. There just isn't enough money to cover everything that is unbudgeted right now. We have to make some changes and we have to make some budgetary adjustments. Everybody that works in this County is on the hook to help out on that cause.

Mr. Hartwick: Thanks for preparing those numbers. That will allow us to track whether or not those investments and new hires will certainly reduce overtime costs. Thanks Commissioner Haste for adding the idea of putting that in an escrow account. That is a great idea.

### **REPORT FROM CHIEF CLERK/CHIEF OF STAFF – CHAD SAYLOR**

Mr. Saylor: I have nothing to report at this time, however, I would like to extend my thanks and gratitude for the kind comments you guys made last week. I am very appreciative of that and for the opportunity you have given me here to serve you and the people of Dauphin County and to also briefly thank the staff, administrators and row officers here who have been very generous and kind in welcoming me as I get to know my way around. In particular, Mr. Burns, who is a great friend and is very helpful to me and I appreciate his continuing services. I was also going to thank my wife, but she lost interest and left.

### **SOLICITOR'S REPORT**

Mr. Knupp: The Solicitor's Report from Workshop has been forwarded with no changes from Workshop. I would be happy to entertain any questions. Mr. Tully was asked by the President Judge to accompany him for a matter that was in the paper this morning that they are working on together.

### **MATTERS REQUIRING BOARD ACTION**

Mr. Haste: We have items requiring board action, training packet, Mr. Saylor.

Mr. Saylor: There are 22 items on the packet and none have been added since the Workshop.

Mr. Haste: Item B, I believe we have someone who is going to brief us on South Central Assembly.

Mr. Zumburum: I am the Executive Director of the South Central Assembly. Dan Robinson asked if I might come and give you a couple comments about what we have been doing with the donations that Dauphin County has made over the last few years and where we hope to go in the next year.

Mr. Haste: Did Dan tell you about the questions that were raised at last week's Workshop Meeting? Most of us being new and again as you have heard our budget is tight so we are looking at everything. The question was asked, "What does the \$2,600 get us and what is being done". We just need to understand the benefit of us being a member and how this differs from some of the other organizations such as the Planning Commission or Chamber, to make sure that we are not duplicating efforts.

Mr. Zumburum: The greatest generalization that could be made about the benefits of an eight county regional entity is that we do represent a unique piece of geography in Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania was divided up into uniform regional planning districts back in 1965. All but South Central Pennsylvania were able to receive Federal funding assistance, either through the Appalachian Regional Commission or the Economic Development Administration. So, they had Federal funding support to affiliate. Our region did not. We were relatively speaking, too healthy. In 1996, members of the previous boards of commissioners, the mayors office, township supervisors and members of the business community gathered and said if we don't create a non-profit organization to do the kind of work that is done by other economic development and regional planning entities, we won't have the quality of life that we want to have. That is essentially what we work on, on an eight county basis. We create a forum for eight counties to try to work together. As a non-profit group, we host committees that deal with aspects of governance, but not from a strictly governmental standpoint, but rather also from an academic and from a business standpoint. We do a lot of training and educational programs, because we are hosted by the Penn State Institute of State and Regional Affairs. Last year, just to name a few, we did housing counselor training. Many Dauphin County participants were there. We did downtown retail promotion workshops, again participants from Dauphin County were there. Neighborhood organizational programs to support the viability of neighborhood organizations and what they can do to support government. We have been working on an industrial cluster analysis on an eight county basis trying to create the forum to do that kind of discussion that spans across the boundaries of not just people in economic development, but also government and academia. We have done some studies, recently a retail downtown promotion drive analysis of the twelve main old boroughs and cities of the region. In Dauphin County, we were talking about Harrisburg. We would like to do a second tier of those in the coming years so we would be looking at other communities like Steelton,

Middletown, perhaps Lykens and Millersburg. We have been involved in anti-predatory lending activity. That is something that has really attacked our region in the last five years. 112% increase in foreclosures. This is not an urban problem, it is not a rural problem, it is not a suburban problem, but it hits all income strata and it hits all communities in the region. We would like to continue that work. We have done specific training for attorneys on how to combat predatory lending. When they face it, it is a relatively difficult thing to do. We would like to continue our work with housing counseling organizations in that regard. We have provided other kinds of services. We have crafted a housing paper advocating to the State government for renewed consideration of more flexible funding, particularly, for our old boroughs and cities for infill housing development that is not limited to low income housing development. We are doing a similar effort on a regional transportation vision. We really do have corridors that truly span the eight counties, Route 81 and Route 30. And yet, there is no viable entity that expands across those boundaries. In that regard we have been trying again to work with PennDOT folks and the other economic development players that have a role in transportation planning, particular the land use aspects and the environmental concerns and talk about this in a much more realistic context of eight counties. Basically your investment matches the investment of the other partnering local governments that was originally established to get us started at basically a cent per capita and that is where your figure comes from the 2002 census. Most of our funding that supports our operation has come from other municipal partners and from our administration of the KOZ Program, which we do here in Dauphin County, Steelton, Highspire, Harrisburg, Millersburg and Upper Paxton Township. That window of opportunity will open again this year. We don't know whether or not there may be an expansion of that program, but we would hope to do that as well. Some of you may know that we have been advocating very hard for a regional intermodal freight movement study. We have been trying to accomplish that and pull together the pieces to make that work. That would be a data base; which would help us establish a more realistic vision of the kinds of long term maintenance issues and expansion issues that we need to, for all aspects, of transit of freight. That is the long and the short of what we do. We do most of our work, extremely efficient. We are a staff of three and we are able to buy some support services from Penn State at cost; which is a tremendous benefit to us. Anyone else would have to pay the University's overhead, but because we have an annual contract for service we remove that 57% overhead cost. I think you are getting an awful lot for your money.

Mr. Haste: I sit on HATS and I am very aware of that study. I hadn't put the two together.

Mr. Zumbur: We had a meeting yesterday. Staff from Tri-County were there and we are looking at trying to divide that study into a two year application process and we think that will be more readily acceptable by PennDOT. We are not looking for any cash match from any local participating entity, but rather we are asking for a data and service match; which we would think would minimally come to about \$10,000 over a two year period just for the donation value of the purchase of that data. It seems that as of

yesterday, we were a little bit closer to having an agreement on that and we will see what happens on Friday.

Mr. Haste: The Friday HATS meeting. Will you be there?

Mr. Zumbrum: Yes.

Mr. Hartwick: I just think this was a matter of understanding what your organization does and what we receive in turn for the investment, making sure there wasn't a duplication of efforts that are going on with various regional efforts. I appreciate you coming in and letting us know exactly what function your organization performs.

Mr. Zumbrum: I appreciate being here and I will put in a plug for our annual Summit; which is an annual event building this year again on an economic development theme, looking at regional assets and how we can look to enhance them.

Mr. DiFrancesco: Using this as an example, the KOZ, you mentioned that you have the administrative oversight in this area, who are the decision makers, how does that come together, who is at the table when decisions are made, who makes the decision whether or not to expand the KOZ, and those types of things.

Mr. Zumbrum: The KOZ program requires the active participation of county government, local government and the school district for specific sites. Originally authorized by a law in 1998, it was not anticipated that that program would be expanded ever. However, it has been done three times and apparently the new administration is attracted to this program. I have had tremendous success stories coming out of some of the jurisdictions, where a redevelopment authority could directly negotiate with a perspective developer. In York, for example, we had sites that were flood sites from 1972 that had been demolished and cleared and off the tax rolls for the 32 years that suddenly become attractive to a developer. We have not had that kind of success to date in some of our other jurisdictions, particularly here in Dauphin County. In part because a lot of the real estate was either privately held or was held by the public housing authority. The housing authority, when we initially entered into nominating some of that property, had intended to do a demolition effort and a new construction effort. It became apparent that HUD, which had the veto right essentially to that plan wasn't as interested as they initially appeared when we put the application together for demolition reconstruction. Nevertheless, we have had some recent activity this year on sites. One site in Harrisburg. We had a lot of interest in the Highspire area and there is a small reuse in Millersburg, Upper Paxton Township. The lesson learned from the other communities where we are seeing development is that if you can have local control and ownership by a government entity you can do a lot more aggressive negotiation with a perspective developer. The other opportunity that I think happened in York is that they just concluded their comprehensive planning process, a five year effort, and so the community at a whole was willing to accept some dramatic changes in the neighborhoods without a lot of debate. They had been through that process in the planning process. If we would nominate additional property in this County it would be

very good if you could look to an entity like an economic development entity or a redevelopment entity that might become an agent, more actively involved in the process.

Mr. Haste: Are you hearing this Dan?

Mr. Robinson: Yes.

Mr. Zumbur: The window closes in May so if there would be Dauphin County property to consider, it would be wise to start having those discussions with the local governing bodies, as well as the school districts to see how comfortable they are. I found that the school districts are the most difficult groups to work with quite frankly, because they receive the greater hit to the real estate taxes. Although, often cases the impact is not as great as they perceive it initially to be.

Mr. Haste: We have Items A through EE. I would like to explain what Item E is. This is a follow-up to a recommendation we got in our audit last year from ZA suggesting that we put together an audit committee that will serve as the liaison between the management teams, the departments and the auditing staff. It is a way to keep an eye on things throughout the year. It is on there just for approval of the Board to move forward with the recommendation that was in the audit. This would be set up following GFOA recommendations. If we move forward it would be an assignment for the Chief Clerk to begin to put this together and bring it back to us.

Mr. Hartwick: Just one amendment to Item K, we have begun the process of structuring an RFP to allow more than just one consultant to come in to take a look at that proposal. I want to pull K and we will come back with the authorization of that RFP at the Workshop Meeting next week.

Mr. Haste: If there is nothing else to discuss or pull, is there a motion to approve Items A through EE, minus K?

It was moved by Mr. Hartwick and seconded by Mr. DiFrancesco that the Board approve the following Items A through EE, minus K, under "Matters Requiring Board Action"; motion carried.

- A. Training Packet
- B. Approval of continuing financial support for 2004 to the South Central Assembly for Effective Governance in an amount of \$2,618.00.
- C. Application for an Intergovernmental Cooperation Grant Program submitted by Tri- or Dauphin County Planning Commission, on behalf of Derry Township, East Hanover Township, Lower Paxton Township, South Hanover Township, Susquehanna Township and West Hanover Township, to Dauphin County to complete Routes 39/743 Transportation Study.
- D. Accept a Proposal from Herbert, Rowland & Grubic, Inc., for a Multi-Bridge

Deck Rehabilitation Project for engineering services.

- E. Appoint an Audit Committee.
- F. Change Order No. 2002-01-25 with Triangle Communications, Inc., security contractor, revising the contract substantial completion from December 19, 2004 to May 14, 2004 for Phase I renovations to the Dauphin County Courthouse. (No additional cost to the County)
- G. Appointments to the Local Emergency Planning Committee:
  - 1. Dominic D. DiFrancesco, II replacing Lowman Henry
  - 2. George P. Hartwick, III, replacing Anthony M. Petrucci
  - 3. Matt Hollis replacing Michael Finkerbinder (Red Cross Rep.)
- H. Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness Grant Agreement between Dauphin County Emergency Management and Pennsylvania Emergency Management Agency in an amount of \$6,000.
- I. Approval of the Dauphin County Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) submitted to the Pennsylvania Emergency Management Agency.
- J. Submission of the 2004 Commonwealth of Pennsylvania's Annual Statement of Work to submitted by Dauphin County Emergency Management Agency. The EMPG Program is the mechanism in which the County receives federal grant moneys to offset the EMA Director's salary.
- K. Broker Authorization Letter authorizing Gallagher Benefit Services to contact Highmark Blue Shield accessing health care data and prepare a comprehensive proposal. (PULLED)
- L. Subordination Agreement with Audrey Cowden, formerly Audrey Raistrick for property located at 3916 Kingsley Drive, Harrisburg, PA (Economic Development/Affordable Housing Program)
- M. Subordination Agreement with Brenda Wilson-Parker for property located at 580 N. 66<sup>th</sup> Street, Harrisburg, PA (Economic Development/Affordable Housing Program)
- N. Maintenance Agreement with ThyssenKrupp Elevator Company for 8 units located at Spring Creek Rehab. & Health Care Center (Spring Creek)
- O. Subrecipient Agreement between the County and the County Redevelopment Authority for FY 2004-06 for the Dauphin County Community Development Block Grant Program (Economic Development)
- P. Pest Control Agreement with Orkin Exterminating Company for the Spring Creek Kitchen and all remaining buildings of the complex (Spring Creek)
- Q. Memorandum of Understanding with the PA State Police for the Commonwealth Law Enforcement Assistance Network

- (CLEAN) terminal located in the Communications Center  
(Emergency Management)
- R. Ground Lease between Dauphin County and the Harrisburg Authority for use of the Authority land for the proposed County Materials Recycling Facility (Solid Waste)
  - S. Maintenance Contract Renewal with Intergraph Public Safety for the Computer Aided Dispatch System located in the Communications Center (Emergency Management)
  - T. Maintenance Agreement with G.R. Sponaugle Service Company, LLC for HVAC Customized Professional Maintenance Program II for equipment located in the Kitchen and the McBride Building (Spring Creek)
  - U. Maintenance Agreement with Kenney Mechanicals for HVAC equipment located at the Wildwood Visitor Center (Parks & Recreation)
  - V. Hold Harmless Agreement with Harrisburg Area Road Runners to utilize certain roadways/lands at the Wildwood Lake Sanctuary on November 4, 2004 (Parks & Recreation)
  - W. Approval by the Board of Commissioners to approve Settlement Agreements (2) for the C-K Governor's Place, LP Tax Assessment Appeal and the Wedgewood Hills Apartment Assoc., Ltd. (Tax Assessment Board)
  - X. Amendment to Purchase of Service Agreement with Northwestern Human Services (Amendment #1) (MH/MR)
  - Y. Purchase of Service Agreement with Glade Run Lutheran Services (Children & Youth)
  - Z. Adoption Assistance Agreement 2003-18 (Children & Youth)
  - AA. Amendment #2 to Adoption Assistance Agreement 1996-06 (Children & Youth)
  - BB. Purchase of Service Agreements with:  
(Area Agency on Aging)
    - 1. Otis Elevator Company (Area Agency Kitchen)
    - 2. SimplexGrinnel (Area Agency Kitchen)
  - CC. Employee Assistance Program Agreement with Riegler, Shienvold & Associates  
January 1, 2004 through March 31, 2004  
(Personnel)

- DD. Termination of Tenancy Agreement with the Union Deposit Corporation for the Visitors Center.
- EE. Permission to include the "Bowl for Kids' Sake" pamphlets with the County paychecks

## **FORMER BUSINESS**

There was no former business.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

Mr. Hartwick: Only one item, I believe I made the Commissioners aware about the potential use of interns in the Commissioners' Office and various other departments within County government. We would be utilizing individuals, who may need hours to perform for college credits, at no cost to the County. Available staff can certainly provide a great deal of assistance. I am going to take it one step further and reach out to the local colleges and universities in the region to say that the opportunity does exist here in Dauphin County, as long as we are taking a look at any liability that exists. I think the potential of having great fresh minds, who are energetic and enthusiastic in the area of communications and public service should be an essential part of assisting with the great deal of work load that we have here in Dauphin County. I brought one individual who made that request to the table and I made everyone aware of that. The process that we are going to take is to go through Faye and have it be noted. I don't believe formal action needs to be taken. I just wanted to bring that to the attention of the Commissioners. If there is any additional direction or concerns that they may have about the process, certainly should be relayed so we can work it out in the future to make this an easy way for college students to do meaningful work. One of the biggest disadvantage to getting people into public service, is that we often have them making copies or doing something meaningless and they have a passion to serve and to be helpful to come up with real meaningful tasks and ways that they can assist us moving the County forward that will not only serve us, but serve them extremely well. I am in support of doing that in the future.

Mr. DiFrancesco: I would like to commend you on the idea. I probably will be moving in that direction as well. I would also like to suggest to the Board that we have to look for opportunities throughout County government to get interns good quality exposure to the career that they may want to get into, whether communications or human services or whatever that may be. We will be able to achieve some projects that maybe are not that high on the radar. The interesting thing about it is that we want to try to keep our young people here in Central Pennsylvania. It is an opportunity to expose them to the workplace environment here and what we have to offer in Dauphin County with the hopes of when they graduate from college or wherever they go, they see the value in staying here in their home area or for those that are coming to school from outside this area, relocating here. Internship is a great tool, a great resource that the County can get a lot of mileage out of, but also that our young people can really get some good quality experience.

I would like to comment on one area. It is an area that is very important to me and for those who have had the opportunity to read the newspaper today, it is becoming more and more public that the emergency management services in this County are under a great strain and great stress. This is an issue that has been with me from my days in Lower Swatara Township on the Board and today it just so happened that my local ambulance service that supplies the needs to my area, the one that was in the paper. We cannot continue down this road where all of our ambulance companies are under financial distress, are all on the verge of closing doors unless some major incident happens. Action has to be taken primarily at the Federal level. It also has to happen at the State and local level. I just wanted to let my colleagues know that I will be moving forward in a formal way to work with our State Legislative delegation, our Congressman and U.S. Senators, if I can get them onboard, as well as local communities and ambulance companies in particular to come up with a plan and move forward. This is an issue that I have worked hard on in the past and will continue to do because I think it is critical. We cannot move forward in this community without having good quality EMS services being provided and quite honestly the funding at the Federal level and the way that insurance companies reimburse people who use ambulance services is just appalling. Those policies are placing these ambulance companies at risk of going under. Our senior population, our extensive network of roads and so forth we are going to have accidents on a daily basis, we need to have access to quality emergency medical health care. That is as important as any other level of health care. I will be looking forward to doing whatever I can bring to the table in terms of resolving this major, major community crisis issue.

## **CORRESPONDENCE**

Mr. Haste: The correspondence listed below, was received by the Office and will be handled appropriately by the staff.

- A. Notification from Rettew that Penbrook Borough is submitting an Application for a General Permit No. 3 (Streambank Stabilization) and No. 5 (Utility Line Crossing) to DEP for the Penbrook Interceptor Repair Project.
- B. Notification from R. J. Fisher & Associates, Inc. that Lower Swatara Fire Department is filing an application with DEP, through the Dauphin County Conservation District, for a General NPDES Permit to discharge stormwater from construction activities for the proposed development of a new fire house.
- C. Receipt from AmerGen of the Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1 (TMI-1) Docket No. 50-289, Operating License No. DPR-50, Long Range Planning Program (LRPP) Annual Update of Integrated Schedule "ABC" Project Listing.
- D. Notification from Buchart-Horn, Inc. that East Hanover Township is applying to DEP for a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit for the new East Hanover Township Wastewater Treatment Plant that will be located on Dairy Lane.

## **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Mr. Haste: Is there any one in the audience that would like to address the Board.  
(There was no public participation.)

## **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, it was moved by Mr. DiFrancesco and seconded by Mr. Hartwick that the Board adjourn.

Transcribed by: Richie Martz

Respectfully submitted,

Chad Saylor, Chief Clerk/Chief of Staff